

329.971
C7792

THE ISSUES IN THE COMING ELECTION



G. G. COOTE

**An Address by G. G. Coote at the Macleod Federal
Constituency Convention at High River,
August 2nd, 1926.**

The address of George Coote, the U.F.A. candidate for Macleod and member of the riding since 1921, is one of the very best that has been delivered in the present campaign. It is well that he decided to be a candidate for re-election. It was a speech without prejudice and with courage.
Mr. Coote is a credit to the province. — Calgary
Albertan.

9440

THE ISSUES IN THE COMING ELECTION

When Parliament met last session we were faced with an unprecedented situation. Ever since Confederation, Canada has been governed under a two-party system. This was the first Parliament since Confederation that one of the old parties did not have a clear majority in the House. These two parties would not co-operate with each other to carry on government. The chief aim of whichever party is out of office is to defeat the government in the hope that they may secure power themselves.

Organized a Group at Ottawa

Our U. F. A. members had organized as a group with Mr. Gardiner as Chairman, and Mr. Spencer as Secretary. I think it was decided practically unanimously that we should meet with the Progressives, and at that meeting Mr. Spencer was appointed Whip for the whole Progressive group and Mr. Gardiner was appointed our Alberta member on the executive. If parliamentary government were to be carried on it was necessary that our group should co-operate with either one of the old parties. I stated at our Annual Convention a year ago that we should co-operate with whichever party would give us justice, or the nearest approach to it. We quite realized the danger we were in in co-operating with either of the old parties. The majority of our members belonged to either one of these parties before we started our political movement. There was danger that former Liberals would be offended if we co-operated with the Conservatives and that former Conservatives would be offended if we co-operated with the Liberals. I considered it to be our duty to co-operate with the party whose legislative policies were to our economic advantage.

How Our Members' Decision Was Reached

We could not allow party prejudices or personal preferences for party leaders to influence us in our decision. Our executive sent a letter to Mr. Meighen and to Mr. King, asking them to state their attitude on a number of public questions which we considered were of primary importance to

our constituents. The more important questions were, in my opinion, the Crows' Nest Grain Rates, the Tarriff, Alberta's Natural Resources, Long-term Rural Credits, and Re-valuation of Soldier Settlers' Lands. The letters to Mr. King and Mr. Meighen and their replies have been published in the press and there is no need to read them here. Following this correspondence our executive met both Mr. King and Mr. Meighen and discussed these matters with them. Mr. King assured us that there would be no interference from his government with the Crows' Nest Grain Rates. He stated that an Agreement had been signed between his government and the government of Alberta for the return of the natural resources to the Province, and that legislation confirming the agreement would be introduced early in the session. He also stated that his government would introduce a long-term Farm Loans Bill which he was sure would be satisfactory to us. A Bill for re-valuation of soldier settlers' lands would also be introduced. Mr. King pointed out that legislation which we desired on many of these matters was promised in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Meighen's Attitude on Crows' Nest Pass Rates

To give you Mr. Meighen's attitude in regard to the Crows' Nest grain rates I cannot do better than read you a paragraph from his letter of January 9th to Mr. Forke.

"I refer to the following suggestions:

1. Tarriff.
2. Hudson's Bay Railway.
5. Statutory freight rates on grain and flour.
6. Public ownership of national railways.
7. The Income Tax.
8. Transfer of natural resources to the prairie provinces.
9. Trade relations with the United States.

With respect to these suggestions the stand of the Conservative party has been fully and repeatedly outlined by myself in the House of Commons and along practically the same lines elaborated in the country. So far as I know it has never been charged that my attitude as leader on any of these suggestions has been equivocal or obscure. In our interview today all points on which elucidation was desired were cleared up. I, therefore, need make no further reference to them now."

Anyone who has read Mr. Meighen's speeches in Parliament on the Crows' Nest Grain Rates knows that his stand has always been that these statutory rates should be repealed and the fixing of the grain rates should be left to the Board of Railway Commissioners on which Western Canada has one member out of six. Mr. Meighen made a statement to our executive to the effect that he would not interfere with these rates unless and until someone else raised the issue. We were sure that the railways would soon raise the issue, that Mr. Meighen would then bring down legislation to repeal these rates and we would be forced to vote against him and defeat him, thus bringing on an election.

With regard to Rural Credits legislation, Mr. Meighen stated that he was anxious to see a sound system of rural credits established in Canada, but he did not think that legislation could be put through at that session.

Meighen Non-Committal on Natural Resources

He was in favor of the transfer of the Natural Resources to Alberta but would not commit himself as to the Agreement which had been entered into between the Province and the Dominion. He had not seen the Agreement and, therefore, did not know whether he could agree to it or not. The natural inference was that if he did not approve of all the terms of this Agreement it would be necessary to negotiate an entirely new agreement with little likelihood of it being settled at that session. Negotiations for the transfer of these resources have been carried on for so many years that it seemed wise on our part to co-operate with the Government that had signed this Agreement. Surely they would put it through, and the securing of these resources on terms acceptable to the Province would in itself be a worthy achievement for one session.

After careful consideration of all the issues involved the majority decided that we should co-operate with the Liberals in putting through this legislative program. It is probable we were influenced to some extent by the attitude of some Conservative members towards us. One member from Ontario who sat not far from me said to us one night, "We don't want your support. If you were supporting us I could not be re-elected." I felt very much like telling him that if the people of Ontario were as narrow as that there was not much use of us sending representatives to Ottawa any longer. On one of the first occasions on which we voted with the Government one of these Conservatives said, "Oh, every one of them has his price!" I do not think there is a man or woman in this audience who believes I have my price. It is very hard to

co-operate with men of that type, and may I say that I, with others, took more abuse this session than I ever hope to take again without giving some in return.

I would like you also to remember that at that time the whole Conservative press in Eastern Canada was demanding an election, and most of the Conservative members were anxious for another election. Many of us believed that if Mr. Meighen were called on to form a government we would be forced, inside of a very few months, to either abandon our principles or defeat him in the House and force an election. There was also a small Labor group in the House that we had been co-operating with in the former parliament. We were in very close touch with these men and knew they were in favor of co-operating with the Government. There really was an honest effort made by these different groups to co-operate for the purpose of securing some important legislation. What were the results of this co-operation?

Some Results of Co-operation

First—One of the most satisfactory budgets which has been brought down in years. I think our group can be given credit for forcing a reduction of the duty on automobiles. This I believe to be one of the most popular moves which any government has made for many years.

Second—A Long-term Farm Loans Bill. We insisted on having a Bill which would be effective in taking care of the long-term credit needs of the farmers and reducing the rate of interest. The Bill, though not exactly what we wanted, was nevertheless a very fair attempt to meet the need and probably as good as could be gotten through the Senate.

Third—The Campbell Grain Bill which aimed to give the farmer the right to designate the terminal elevator to which his grain should be shipped. This Bill received practically the unanimous support of the Liberals and a majority of the Conservatives on the Agricultural Committee. It passed the Commons without a division but was held up in the Senate.

Fourth—An Old Age Pension Bill which the Government a year before declared it could not introduce. This Bill went through the House of Commons without a division, but it was afterwards killed in the Senate.

Fifth—A Bill for the re-valuation of soldier settlers' lands. The Government had declared a year previously that this would cost the country too much money and they could not put it through, but this session this Bill went through the House of Commons without a division.

Value of Strong Driving Force

The results of the session show that what the Government at Ottawa needs is some driving force behind it, and our group supplied that driving force. I do not think there has been a session of the House of Commons for many years that can show legislation of equal value to that passed at the last session of Parliament. Why some of these Bills did not become law is another story and I will deal with that in a few minutes, but may I say now that the responsibility rests upon Mr. Meighen and not on us?

All through the session a continual fight to defeat the Government was waged by the Conservative opposition. There were more Want-of-Confidence motions brought forward and more recorded votes than at any session I have attended. They were all moved for the one purpose of defeating the Government or embarrassing us. I will mention only one of them, known in Parliament as the "Butter Amendment," introduced by Donald Sutherland. It was supposed to refer to the Australian Treaty, though it did not mention it specifically. That, I suppose, was because Dr. Manion, a member of the present government, and other prominent Conservatives had voted for it. We were asked to defeat the Government on the grounds that this Treaty was ruining the dairy industry. But what were the actual facts? On the day of the vote on this amendment I received a cream price list from a friend of mine in High River on which he had written a note to the effect that he believed this was the highest price paid for cream since the year 1921, and I found on inquiry from the Department at Ottawa that the price was higher than at any time since the year 1922. We took, I think, about two weeks discussing this Butter Amendment, which shows how the time of Parliament is wasted. In contrast with this, one of the most important Bills of the session, the Long-term Farm Loans Bill, passed the House of Commons in one day. This certainly shows the necessity of a change in the present system which is carried on at Ottawa. If this amendment had carried it would have meant the defeat of the Government, but would not have affected the Australian Treaty in any way.

The Report on the Customs Scandals

The co-operative idea worked very well until about the end of the session when considerable dissension was caused by the neglect of the Government to proceed with the transfer of the Natural Resources and the report of the special committee investigating the Customs' Department came before the House. This committee consisted of four Liberals, four Conservatives, and one representative from our group, Mr. Kennedy of Peace River. I have not time to go into the matter at any length but, briefly, Mr. Kennedy's report was

to the effect that the Government were open to censure for their neglect to take effective measures to safeguard the revenue of the Customs' Department which is the chief revenue collecting Department of the Government. The evidence showed that the Government was aware of serious mismanagement in the Customs' Department at least a year before Mr. Bureau was removed as Minister. The action of the Government in appointing him to the Senate should be censured. Mr. King toured this country last year demanding a reform of the Senate, yet he appointed Mr. Bureau to the Senate when he must have known that a deplorable condition had been allowed to develop in his Department while he was Minister.

Had Not Promised to "Cover Up" Government

As I saw it there was only one thing for us to do, that was to stand by Mr. Kennedy in this matter. One of the reasons why we took political action was, to use a familiar expression, "to clean up politics." This could not be done by whitewashing the Government. We had promised to co-operate with the Liberals in putting through a legislative program, but we had not promised to whitewash any sins of administration of which they might be found guilty. Had there been no independent group in the House it is doubtful if any special committee would have been appointed. There would have been no censure of the Government, and probably very little clean up of the Customs' Department. In the past such things have often been covered up by party majority. I believe it was owing to Mr. Kennedy's presence on the committee that the Duncan report was published and that all persons and papers asked for by any member of the committee were produced. There was one fact brought out by the committee which neither Mr. Meighen nor Mr. King is likely to mention; That is, that one of the biggest distilleries in Canada was contributing to the campaign funds of both parties and I would ask you to remember that the export of liquor to the United States is chiefly responsible for this smuggling business. It is illegal to import liquor into the United States and I think it is time that this country prohibited the exporting of liquor to the United States: I consider it is an unfriendly act.

Brought Dissolution When Censure Threatened

When it appeared likely that the amendment of Mr. Stephens to the report of the Customs' Committee, which was really a vote of censure on the Government, was likely to carry in the House, Premier King asked the Governor-General to dissolve Parliament. His Excellency refused this request and Mr. King and his Ministers resigned on Monday, June

28th. His Excellency then sent for Mr. Meighen and asked him to accept the office of Prime Minister. Mr. Meighen accepted the position, and on Tuesday, Sir Henry Drayton appeared as acting leader for the new Government. I am referring to these events very briefly as our time is limited and you are probably well informed regarding them, but I want to deal very frankly with a statement which has appeared in the press that when Mr. Meighen accepted the task of forming a Cabinet he had been promised our support. The statement passed at our caucus was to the effect that we would assist the new administration in completing the work of the session. We also stated that we were opposed to dissolution of Parliament until the Customs' investigation had been completed. The statement has been made that this led Mr. Meighen to accept the responsibility of forming a government or that it led His Excellency to ask Mr. Meighen to accept the Premiership. Sir Henry Drayton's statement made in Parliament on June 29th, referring to Mr. Meighen's acceptance of the Premiership stated: "Mr. Meighen advised His Excellency last evening he would undertake this task and was sworn in this morning as Prime Minister, Secretary of State, and President of the Council."

The memorandum passed by the Progressive caucus and given to Mr. Forke was passed about twelve o'clock the following day and the statement made by Sir Henry Drayton must surely have been prepared before Mr. Forke's interview with the Governor-General as Parliament met at two o'clock that day. We did not know that Mr. Meighen would attempt to carry on without any Ministers in the House.

Did Government Seek to Complete Business?

I do not know what passed between Mr. Forke and His Excellency, but for my part I contend that I lived up to the statement which passed our caucus. I felt it my duty to assist the new administration to wind up the business of the session, and I supported them by my vote on three occasions, but I would like to put this question to you: Did the new administration endeavor to complete the business of the session? Referring again to Sir Henry Drayton's statement (Hansard, p. 5292) he said: "The Government deems it its duty to give Parliament an opportunity of dealing with all such matters as should be disposed of prior to the close of the session." After the sitting on Tuesday night, he was questioned by Mackenzie King as to what business was to be taken up the following day. After Sir Henry replied, Mr. King asked him whether they were going to proceed with the Natural Resources Bill and Sir Henry's reply was, "We do not propose to take any action, one way or the other, in the dying days

of the session in connection with that legislation." This Bill had been on the order paper of the House for three months. About two weeks prior to this the Conservatives considered the natural resources question so important that they tried to defeat the government because they had not carried through the legislation. Do you not think it was one matter that should have been disposed of prior to the close of the session? So far as Alberta was concerned, it was the most important business of the session.

Most Anxious About Natural Resources

On Thursday Mr. Robb introduced a motion to the effect that the acting ministers had no right to move and receive supply in the name of His Majesty. There was no doubt in my mind that Mr. Robb's motion was right. Of course, I could have voted against it and justified my vote on the ground of expediency, the matter of winding up the business of the session, but the business which I was most anxious about was the transfer of our natural resources. If this illegally constituted government was able to wind up the session in their own fashion, no action would be taken at all in regard to this question. We had been told, on what I considered good authority, that the Governor-General would not give a dissolution to Mr. Meighen any more than to Mr. King. Under the circumstances, if Mr. Robb's motion carried, I had a right to expect that Mr. Meighen would adjourn the House for six weeks, elect his cabinet in the usual way, and meet Parliament to wind up the business of the session. I was told privately that the excuse given by Mr. Meighen for not taking up the Natural Resources Bill was that he was without a seat in the House, he did not have a Minister in the House, and as the resources question would likely be contentious he would not attempt to put it through. Neither Mr. Meighen nor his acting ministers would make any statement of what they would do at any future session in regard to the resources. They expected us to support them through everything, though they refused to commit themselves on the Natural Resources question. I wanted Mr. Meighen to elect his ministers, get a seat for himself, and meet Parliament in a legal manner to complete the business of the session. Then we could have demanded of him the transfer of the Natural Resources or defeat him if he refused.

No Need to Dissolve Parliament

Mr. Meighen had no need to dissolve Parliament because of this vote and he certainly had no moral right to dissolve it while it was in session. He should have met Parliament the next day and asked for an adjournment to allow him to elect his cabinet or he could have brought in a bill to amend the

law so that private members could accept portfolios in the Cabinet without losing their seats in the Commons. If he was too high and mighty to do this, he might at least have had His Excellency come down to Parliament and give royal assent to such bills as had been passed and prorogue Parliament before dissolution. His action in dissolving Parliament in this high-handed manner is, in my opinion, absolutely indefensible. If the people of Canada are ready to approve of that action we may as well cease pretending that we have representative government in the country. This is not democracy; it is autocracy, pure and simple. We are the victims of a party system in which independent members are not wanted. I hope you will get strongly behind the resolution which was passed here this afternoon asking that a Prime Minister must secure the sanction of a majority of the House of Commons before advising the dissolution of Parliament. Had this rule been in effect in the last Parliament we would have had the business of the session wound up before dissolution.

Both Sides Used Threat of Election

To show you how the threat of an election is used by Prime Ministers in the House let me quote the Honorable Dr. Manion, one of the acting Ministers, from Hansard of July 1st: "All during the session if a question came up when the late government was in any danger whatsoever, the ex-Prime Minister turned to the Honorable Gentlemen of the Progressive party and said, 'If you defeat the Government on this measure it will mean an election.' Yet he now takes the attitude that we are threatening them and are not acting as we should in that regard." You can see from this quotation that both sides continually used this threat of an election. In his next paragraph he intimated that Mr. Meighen had no more right to a dissolution than Mr. King. He also admitted that they could have asked for an adjournment of the session to elect a cabinet. He said they were attempting to carry on for the convenience of the members, but in reality it was for their own convenience. Just imagine a government so anxious to complete the business of the session that it could not adjourn Parliament for a month to elect Cabinet Ministers and meet Parliament in a legal manner and three days after making this statement they dissolved Parliament without prorogation and without getting royal assent to such Bills as had passed Parliament. Suppose we had voted against Mr. Robb's motion on the ground of expediency. I am sure the result would have been the same so far as securing the passing of legislation is concerned. The Liberals were blocking the business of the government just as the Conservatives had blocked business for the previous five months. I was assured by a prominent Liberal that night that they were prepared to keep this blockade up for three or four weeks.

The only way in which the business could have been wound up would have been by use of the Closure. Rule 17-B distinctly states that closure can be moved only by a Minister of the Crown and the new government had no Minister in the House to move it. From what I know of Mr. Meighen I am sure that he would have dissolved Parliament within the next few days anyway on the ground that he could not get the House of Commons to vote supply. As I have already said, I supported the new government on the first three votes. If the government had been constituted in the usual legal manner I would have continued to support them in winding up the business of the session, but I cannot see why I should now be criticized for voting for Mr. Robb's motion when you consider Mr. Meighen's action in regard to the Natural Resources question.

Why Parliamentary Government is Losing Ground

Parliamentary government all over the world is losing ground. People are losing faith in Parliament. Only about fifty-five per cent. of the voters in Canada take the trouble to vote. I think the reason is that as a rule there have only been only two parties for them to vote for. Each one has declared the other to be corrupt and incompetent, and a great many of the people believed both of them. This party game as it is now played should cease. If democracy is to survive business methods must be adopted in Parliament. To make Parliament function in a business-like manner, we should change our constitutional practices and allow Parliament itself to elect the Prime Minister and the Cabinet, and remove from the Prime Minister the power to advise dissolution of Parliament without the sanction of a majority of the House of Commons; change the rules of the House to limit speeches to thirty minutes, with certain exceptions; send the estimates covering all government expenditure to committees of the House, and limit debate in committee in the same manner as in the House of Commons. Night sittings should be discontinued altogether. In the last session we often sat until one or two, and on one occasion until five o'clock, in the morning. We should also allow the introduction of public bills by private members. The Senate should also be reformed to make it in some way responsible to the people.

I would like to emphasize the fact that our group are not responsible for this election being brought on at the present time. We have never advocated an election but, on the contrary, have protested in the House that an election was not necessary. On the other hand, leading Conservatives in the House and the Conservative press have been demanding an election ever since last January and Mr. King himself asked the Governor-General for a dissolution of the House.

Why Parties Seek to Divide the People

I would like to urge you not to allow yourselves to be confused by all these issues which are being raised. They are for one purpose only—to get you back to the party fold. While the people are divided into two parties fighting each other the manufacturers, distillers, bankers and other big interests are picking the plums.

Just a few words now in regard to my own work during the session. As you all know, I re-introduced a resolution asking for a reduction of the duty on automobiles and motor trucks. I believe it was as a result of this motion that the reduction of the customs tariff on these articles was brought in. The Tariff on automobiles valued at less than \$1200.00 was reduced from thirty-five per cent. to twenty per cent.; the tariff on all trucks was reduced from thirty-five per cent. to twenty per cent., and on cars over \$1200.00 it was reduced to twenty-seven-and-a-half per cent.

It is sometimes stated that we are interested only in the grain farmers and are neglecting the interests of the stockmen. I want to assure you this is not the case. For the last few years we have been deeply concerned over the condition of the Cattle industry and have given a good deal of thought to the matter of what we could do to assist the industry.

To Open U. S. Market for Canadian Cattle

At the last session I introduced a resolution asking for a special committee to examine into the whole situation of the cattle industry. At their meeting on this resolution the committee recommended that a Canadian representative at Washington should be appointed at once; that the government should enter into negotiations with the United States looking toward the entry of Canadian cattle into the United States market on more favorable terms than at present; that the Canadian customs' tariff against United States cattle should be placed on the same rate and same specific basis as United States tariff against Canadian cattle, with a provision that if the United States tariff duties be removed or reduced, the Canadian duties would thereupon be removed or reduced to the same extent. When considering the United States tariff against our cattle, it should be remembered that for six or seven years, the United States allowed our cattle to enter free of duty. During all that time Canada failed to show any appreciation of this attitude of the United States towards us, and maintained a duty of twenty-five per cent. against American cattle coming to Canada. If we now hope to secure better terms from the United States we must be prepared to extend the same terms to them. Had our Government placed cattle

on the free list ten years ago, and if there had been a Canadian representative at Washington to look after our interests when the Fordney-McCumber tariff law was enacted, it is quite probable no tariff would have been placed against our cattle. It is our opinion that if these recommendations are acted upon it might be possible for the Government to secure the entry of our cattle into the United States market on much more favorable terms.

The Amendment to the Canada Grain Act

I was the Alberta member on a small committee which was appointed to consider changes which should be made in the administration of the Canada Grain Act, so as to avoid as far as possible the unsatisfactory condition which obtained last year in regard to tough and damp grain. It was found that there were not enough moisture testing machines at Calgary and other inspection points to test half the grain that was being graded tough; that in most cases the inspectors' decision was based on his sense of touch. If the grain felt tough to his hand, he graded it tough; if he felt dry he graded straight. You can see that if he happened to have a fever and his hand was hot, most of the grain he inspected would likely be graded tough. If the inspector had any doubts about it, he was supposed to test it. The number of machines at practically every inspection point have now been doubled. Our committee met the Board of Grain Commissioners and the Board agreed that no grain shall be graded tough or damp unless it has been tested for moisture in a proper moisture testing machine, and in all cases where grain is graded tough or damp the quantity of moisture in such grain shall be stamped on the inspection certificate; that appeals on the condition of grain as well as the grade may be made to the Appeal Board; that the research laboratory at Winnipeg should be furnished with a full staff and equipment for the carrying on of research work, particularly to determine the amount of moisture which grain may contain and the loss in weight which should be allowed to any hospital elevator for drying tough or damp grain, and that the Laboratory staff shall regularly inspect all moisture testing machines and report to the Board as to the accuracy and condition of same. We believe that if these recommendations are carried out by the Board we will not again have such an unsatisfactory situation as existed last season in regard to tough and damp grain.

The Plea for "Stable" Government

Just a word in regard to the plea of the Conservative press, to give Meighen a clear majority so that we may have stable Government. I want to suggest one outstanding reason why we can not afford to leave our affairs in the hands of Mr. Meighen.

Our presence at Ottawa for the past five years saved the Crows' Nest Pass Grain Rates. Mr. Meighen's attitude on this matter last session was that he would not interfere with these rates until someone raised the issue. Well, the issue is almost sure to be raised. A recent press despatch states that the B. C. Government has made application to the Railway Commission for leave to prosecute the President and other officers of the C.P.R. for refusal to obey the order of the Board to equalize export rates on grain and flour to Vancouver with rates to Ft. William. No matter which way the Board decides, an appeal is almost sure to be made to the Governor-in-Council by one party or the other. If Meighen is Prime Minister and has a clear majority behind him, there is no question about what he will do.

Is this constituency going to send him a supporter to help give him that clear majority? I hope not.

What 4-cent Bushel Increase Would Mean

An increase of 4 cents per bushel in Freight Rate on grain would mean to a farmer with 5000 bushels of grain to ship—just \$200.00—more freight to pay. It would mean to High River \$47,000.00; to Nanton \$44,000.00. It would mean to this constituency an additional freight bill of \$600,000.00. Do the people of this constituency want to see this amount handed over to the Railways or left in the hands of the farmers, most of it to be spent over the counter of the local merchant.

Before I left Ottawa, I wrote to most of the Directors of our Association, stating that I would not be a candidate at this election. My reasons were chiefly personal, and need not be given here, but I think I was also discouraged to think that we are trying to work under a system where the Prime Minister could dissolve Parliament without getting Royal assent to such Bills as had been passed, thus throwing away most of the work which had been done during the session. Since my return to Alberta great pressure has been brought to bear on me by your board of Directors to reconsider my decision. I have received resolutions from a large number of U. F. A. Locals and letters from a large number of my friends asking me to stand for nomination here today. You have made me feel that it is my duty to stand for nomination, but I wish to assure you that I would much prefer that someone else should be nominated, and I will pledge my support to whoever may be the choice of the convention.

To the Electors of Macleod Federal Constituency:

Mr. Coote has accepted this nomination against his own personal wishes and only after a great deal of urging from our Board of Directors as well as by a large number of fellow citizens. We believe Mr. Coote is too valuable a member for us to lose at this time. The Toronto Saturday Night, in a recent article on the reduction of the tariff on automobiles, said "Mr. Coote himself is one of the best minds of his group." All who believe in Cheaper Automobiles, Low Rates on Grain, Return of Natural Resources to the Province, Rural Credits, Lower Tariff and Old Age Pensions, should vote and work for the re-election of G. G. COOTE, on September the 14th.

The Executive of the Macleod Federal Constituency
of the U. F. A.

VOTE X for COOTE

The ballot in this election must be marked with a cross **X** opposite the name of the candidate the elector wishes to vote for. Any other mark will spoil the ballot. One cross, for one candidate and no other, is the way to mark the ballot.

Mark your ballot for G. G. COOTE, thus:

COOTE, G. G., Farmer, Cayley	X



WESTERN PRINTING & LITHOGRAPHING COMPANY, LIMITED